

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 DARRYL W. HUDSON,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 C. PFEIFFER, et al.,
15 Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-01313-EPG (PC)
ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S SECTION
1983 CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

17 Darryl W. Hudson (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights
18 action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

19 In his complaint, Plaintiff alleges that his cell was searched, and that a deadly weapon
20 was found. Plaintiff further alleges that even though Plaintiff’s cellmate admitted the weapon
21 was his, Plaintiff was issued a Rules Violation Report (“RVR”) and was found guilty.
22 According to a copy of the findings, which Plaintiff attached, Plaintiff lost 360 days of
23 goodtime credits. (ECF No. 1, p. 13). The only relief Plaintiff seeks is to get his “RVR
24 Reversed from Guilty to Not Guilty” and to have the RVR removed from his central file. (*Id.*
25 at 6).

26 “[A] prisoner in state custody cannot use a § 1983 action to challenge the fact or
27 duration of his confinement. He must seek federal habeas corpus relief (or appropriate state
28 relief) instead.” Wilkinson v. Dotson, 544 U.S. 74, 78 (2005) (citations and internal quotation

1 marks omitted).

2 In Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), the United States Supreme Court
 3 held that to recover damages for “harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a
 4 conviction or sentence invalid,” a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence
 5 was reversed, expunged, or otherwise invalidated. This “favorable termination rule” preserves
 6 the rule that federal challenges, which, if successful, would necessarily imply the invalidity of
 7 confinement or its duration, must be brought by way of petition for writ of habeas corpus, after
 8 exhausting appropriate avenues of relief. Muhammad v. Close, 540 U.S. 749, 750-751 (2004).
 9 Accordingly, “a state prisoner’s § 1983 action is barred (absent prior invalidation)—no matter
 10 the relief sought (damages or equitable relief), no matter the target of the prisoner’s suit (state
 11 conduct leading to conviction or internal prison proceedings)—*if* success in that action would
 12 necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of confinement or its duration.” Wilkinson, 544 U.S. at
 13 81-82. The Supreme Court extended the favorable termination rule to prison disciplinary
 14 proceedings. Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 487 (1973); Nettles v. Grounds, 830 F.3d
 15 922, 927-29 (9th Cir. 2016).

16 As Plaintiff is only seeking to have his guilty finding reversed and asking for the RVR
 17 to be removed from his central file, and as it appears that Plaintiff lost goodtime credits,
 18 Plaintiff may have filed a section 1983 action instead of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus
 19 by mistake.

20 Accordingly, the Court will not rule on Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma*
 21 *pauperis* at this time. Instead, the Court will give Plaintiff thirty days to file a notice of
 22 voluntary dismissal pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(A)(1)(A)(i).

23 \\\

24 \\\

25 \\\

26 \\\

27 \\\

1 If Plaintiff does not file a notice of voluntary dismissal within this period, the Court will
2 grant Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, which will obligate Plaintiff to pay
3 the filing fee over time from his prison trust account to the extent funds are available, 28 U.S.C.
4 § 1915(b). Subsequently, the Court will screen Plaintiff's complaint.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: October 19, 2022

8 /s/ *Eric P. Groj*
9
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28